



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,619	03/23/2004	Jeffrey M. Zachan	19308.0022U1	2616
35856 7590 11/13/2007 SMITH FROHWEIN TEMPEL GREENLEE BLAHA, LLC Two Ravinia Drive Suite 700 ATLANTA, GA 30346			EXAMINER YUN, EUGENE	
			ART UNIT 2618	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/13/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/806,619

Applicant(s)

ZACHAN ET AL.

Examiner

Eugene Yun

Art Unit

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 9, 10, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolman et al. (US 6,396,345) in view of Zipper (US 7,088,968)

Referring to Claim 1, Dolman teaches a system for generating amplitude matched, phase shifted signals, comprising:

A filter arrangement including a plurality of nodes (see col. 12, lines 38-44), each node configured to provide an associated vector that is offset in phase from a vector associated with each other node (see col. 9, lines 31-44).

Dolman does not teach an adjustable element associated with each node, the adjustable element configured to receive a feedback signal and in response to the feedback signal substantially equalize an amplitude of each vector associated with each node. Zipper teaches an adjustable element associated with each node, the adjustable element configured to receive a feedback signal and in response to the feedback signal substantially equalize an amplitude of each vector associated with each node (see col. 3, lines 39-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2618

invention was made to provide the teachings of Zipper to said device of Dolman in order to reduce distortion and therefore, reduce interference with nearby channels.

Referring to Claim 9, Dolman teaches a method for generating amplitude matched, phase shifted signals, comprising:

Providing a plurality of vectors, each vector associated with a node, each vector offset in phase from each other associated with each other node (see col. 9, lines 31-44).

Dolman does not teach providing a feedback signal to each node and adjusting each node using the feedback signal to substantially equalize an amplitude of each vector associated with each node. Zipper teaches providing a feedback signal to each node and adjusting each node using the feedback signal to substantially equalize an amplitude of each vector associated with each node (see col. 3, lines 39-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Zipper to said device of Dolman in order to reduce distortion and therefore, reduce interference with nearby channels.

Referring to Claim 18, Dolman teaches a system for generating amplitude matched, phase shifted signals, comprising:

Filter means including a plurality of nodes (see col. 12, lines 38-44), the filter means for providing a plurality of associated vectors that are offset in phase from each other vector associated with each other node (see col. 9, lines 31-44).

Dolman does not teach means for providing a feedback signal to each node and means for using the feedback signal to substantially equalize an amplitude of each vector associated with each node. Zipper teaches means for providing a feedback signal to each node and means for using the feedback signal to substantially equalize an amplitude of each vector associated with each node (see col. 3, lines 39-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Zipper to said device of Dolman in order to reduce distortion and therefore, reduce interference with nearby channels.

Referring to Claim 2, Dolman also teaches four nodes associated with the filter arrangement, each node having an associated vector (see fig. 5b).

Referring to Claim 3, Dolman also teaches an adder element configured to add the four vectors resulting in eight phase shifted vectors (see col. 9, lines 31-41).

Referring to Claim 4, Dolman also teaches a scaler configured to scale the amplitude of the four vectors resulting in eight amplitude matched phase shifted vectors (see col. 10, line 66 to col. 11, line 2).

Referring to Claim 5, Dolman also teaches the adjustable element as an adjustable resistance (see col. 13, lines 5-10).

Referring to Claim 10, Dolman also teaches a resistance associated with each node adjusted to substantially equalize an amplitude of each vector associated with each node (see col. 13, lines 5-10).

Art Unit: 2618

Referring to Claim 19, Dolman also teaches substantially equalizing an amplitude of each vector comprising adjustable resistance means (see col. 13, lines 5-10).

3. Claims 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andren et al. (US 4,485,358) and Dolman and further in view of Zipper.

Referring to Claim 24, Andren teaches a system for generating amplitude matched, phase shifted signals, in a portable communication device, comprising:

A portable communication device including a transmitter and a receiver (see col. 1, lines 60-67);

A synthesizer for providing a local oscillator signal (see col. 8, lines 21-30); and

A filter arrangement configured to operate on the local oscillator signal (see col. 8, lines 31-40).

Andren does not teach the filter arrangement including a plurality of nodes, each node configured to provide an associated vector that is offset in phase from a vector associated with each other node. Dolman teaches the filter arrangement including a plurality of nodes (see col. 12, lines 38-44), each node configured to provide an associated vector that is offset in phase from a vector associated with each other node (see col. 9, lines 31-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Dolman to said device to Andren in order to

better reduce unwanted signal interference when operating with a plurality of nodes.

The combination of Andren and Dolman does not teach an adjustable element associated with each node, the adjustable element configured to receive a feedback signal and in response to the feedback signal substantially equalize an amplitude of each vector associated with each node. Zipper teaches n adjustable element associated with each node, the adjustable element configured to receive a feedback signal and in response to the feedback signal substantially equalize an amplitude of each vector associated with each node (see col. 3, lines 39-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Zipper to the modified device of Andren and Dolman in order to reduce distortion and therefore, reduce interference with nearby channels.

Referring to Claim 25, Dolman also teaches four nodes associated with the filter arrangement, each node having an associated vector (see fig. 5b).

Referring to Claim 26, Dolman also teaches an adder element configured to add the four vectors resulting in eight phase shifted vectors (see col. 9, lines 31-41).

Referring to Claim 27, Dolman also teaches a scaler configured to scale the amplitude of the four vectors resulting in eight amplitude matched phase shifted vectors (see col. 10, line 66 to col. 11, line 2).

Referring to Claim 28, Dolman also teaches the adjustable element as an adjustable resistance (see col. 13, lines 5-10).

4. Claims 6-8, 11-17, and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolman and Zipper and further in view of Koenck et al. (US 5,912,926).

Referring to Claim 6, the combination of Dolman and Zipper does not teach the adjustable resistance as a metal oxide semiconductor field effect transistor (MOSFET) adjustable resistance. Koenck teaches the adjustable resistance as a metal oxide semiconductor field effect transistor (MOSFET) adjustable resistance (see col. 16, lines 1-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Koenck to the modified device to Dolman and Zipper in order to improve modulation sensitivity over a broader range of parameters.

Referring to Claim 7, Koenck also teaches the adjustable element as an adjustable capacitance (see col. 4, lines 41-52).

Referring to Claim 8, Koenck also teaches the adjustable capacitance as a varactor (see col. 1, lines 53-58).

Referring to Claim 11, the combination of Dolman and Zipper does not teach a capacitance associated with each node adjusted to substantially equalize an amplitude of each vector associated with each node. Koenck teaches a capacitance associated with each node adjusted to substantially equalize an amplitude of each vector associated with each node (see col. 4, lines 41-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Koenck to the modified

Art Unit: 2618

device to Dolman and Zipper in order to improve modulation sensitivity over a broader range of parameters.

Referring to Claim 12, Koenck also teaches adjusting the resistance using a metal oxide semiconductor field effect transistor (MOSFET) adjustable resistance (see col. 16, lines 1-12).

Referring to Claim 13, Dolman also teaches combining four vectors associated with each of four nodes resulting in eight phase shifted vectors (see col. 9, lines 31-41).

Referring to Claim 14, Dolman also teaches scaling the four vectors resulting in eight amplitude matched phase shifted vectors (see col. 10, line 66 to col. 11, line 2).

Referring to Claim 15, Koenck also teaches adjusting the capacitance using a varactor (see col. 1, lines 53-58).

Referring to Claim 16, Dolman also teaches combining four vectors associated with each of four nodes resulting in eight phase shifted vectors (see col. 9, lines 31-41).

Referring to Claim 17, Dolman also teaches scaling the four vectors resulting in eight amplitude matched phase shifted vectors (see col. 10, line 66 to col. 11, line 2).

Referring to Claim 20, the combination of Dolman and Zipper does not teach substantially equalizing an amplitude of each vector comprising adjustable capacitance means. Koenck teaches substantially equalizing an amplitude of each vector comprising adjustable capacitance means (see col. 4, lines 41-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Koenck to the modified device to Dolman and Zipper in order to improve modulation sensitivity over a broader range of parameters.

Referring to Claim 21, Koenck also teaches the adjustable resistance means comprising a metal oxide semiconductor field effect transistor (MOSFET) adjustable resistance (see col. 16, lines 1-12).

Referring to Claim 22, Dolman also teaches combining four vectors associated with each of four nodes resulting in eight phase shifted vectors (see col. 9, lines 31-41).

Referring to Claim 23, Dolman also teaches scaling the amplitude of the four vectors resulting in eight amplitude matched phase shifted vectors (see col. 10, line 66 to col. 11, line 2).

5. Claims 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dolman, Zipper, and Andren and further in view of Koenck.

Referring to Claim 29, the combination of Andren, Zipper, and Dolman does not teach the adjustable resistance as a metal oxide semiconductor field effect transistor (MOSFET) adjustable resistance. Koenck teaches the adjustable resistance as a metal oxide semiconductor field effect transistor (MOSFET) adjustable resistance (see col. 16, lines 1-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Koenck to the modified device to Andren, Zipper, and

Art Unit: 2618

Dolman in order to improve modulation sensitivity over a broader range of parameters.

Referring to Claim 30, Koenck also teaches the adjustable element as an adjustable capacitance (see col. 4, lines 41-52).

Referring to Claim 31, Koenck also teaches the adjustable capacitance as a varactor (see col. 1, lines 53-58).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

Art Unit: 2618

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eugene Yun whose telephone number is (571) 272-7860. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew D. Anderson can be reached on (571)272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



MATTHEW ANDERSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER



Eugene Yun
Examiner
Art Unit 2618